arXiv:1108.4714v2 [math.AG] 27 Sep 2011

ON THE GENERIC VANISHING OF CERTAIN KOSZUL COHOMOLOGY GROUPS

JIE WANG

Abstract. We propose a new approach to study Koszul cohomology of general g_d^r's on general curves via degenerations and deformations. As an application of this new method, we prove projective normality for general line bundles L on general curves with $h^1(L) \leq 1$ and degree greater than roughly $\frac{5}{4}g$. This improves the bound in a classical theorem of Green and Lazarsfeld. Also we give some partial results on vanishing of higher syzygies for line bundles with $h^1(L) = 1$.

1. Introduction.

A central problem in curve theory is to describe algebraic curves in a given projective space with fixed genus and degree. We would like to understand the extrinsic geometry of the curve $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$, i.e. information about the defining equations of the curve. Koszul cohomology groups in some sense carry 'everything one wants to know' about the extrinsic geometry of curves in $\mathbb{P}^r$: the number of independent equations of each degree containing the curve, the relations between the generators of the homogeneous ideal, etc. In this paper, we present a new method using deformation theory to study the Koszul cohomolgy groups of general curves in $\mathbb{P}^r$.

Let L be a base point free g_d^r on a smooth curve X, the Koszul cohomology group $K_{p,q}(X, L)$ is the cohomology of the Koszul complex at (p, q)-spot

$$\longrightarrow \wedge^{p+1} H^0(L) \otimes H^0(X, L^{q-1}) \xrightarrow{d_{p+1,q-1}} \wedge^p H^0(L) \otimes H^0(X, L^q) \xrightarrow{d_{p,q}} \wedge^{p-1} H^0(L) \otimes H^0(X, L^{q+1}) \longrightarrow$$

where

$$d_{p,q}(v_1 \wedge ... \wedge v_p \otimes \sigma) = \sum_i (-1)^i v_1 \wedge ... \wedge \widehat{v}_i \wedge .. \wedge v_p \otimes v_i \sigma.$$

Koszul cohomology groups $K_{p,q}(X, L)$ completely determine the shape of a minimal free resolution of the section ring

$$R = R(X, L) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H^0(X, L^k).$$

and therefore carry a lot of information of the extrinsic geometry of X.

In this paper, we are interested in Green's question

Problem 1.1. *(Green) What is the variational theory of the $K_{p,q}(X, L)$? What do they look like for X a general curve and L a general g_d^r?*

Key words and phrases. Koszul Cohomology.

If (X, L) is general in $\mathcal{G}^r_{g,d}$ (in this paper, this means the Brill-Noether number $\rho = g - (r+1)(g - d + r) \geq 0$ and (X, L) is a general point of the unique component of $\mathcal{G}^r_{g,d}$ which dominates $\mathcal{M}_g$), it is well known that (c.f. section 2) we have the following picture of $k_{p,q} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} K_{p,q}(X, L)$:

Table 1.

0	$h^1(L)$	0	...	...	...	0	0	0
0	ρ	$k_{r-2,2}$	...	...	...	$k_{2,2}$	$k_{1,2}$	$k_{0,2}$
0	$k_{r-1,1}$	$k_{r-2,1}$	...	...	...	$k_{2,1}$	$k_{1,1}$	0
0	0	0	...	...	...	0	0	1

where the unknown $k_{p,q}$'s are only in the two middle rows. Also we have $k_{p,1} - k_{p-1,2}$ is a known constant only depending on g, r, d and p, thus it remains to determine $k_{p,1}$ or equivalently $k_{p-1,2}$ for $1 \leq p \leq r - 1$.

Problem 1.1 seems to be too difficult to answer in its full generality at this point as one can see from some special case of it.

In the case $L = K_X$ the problem reduces to the generic Green conjecture, which was solved by Voisin and is essentially the only known case for all p besides some low genus examples.

Theorem 1.2. ([23][24]) *Let X be a general curve of genus $g \geq 4$. Then $K_{i,2}(X, K_X) = 0$ for all $i \leq p$ if and only if $p < Cliff(X) = \lfloor \frac{g-1}{2} \rfloor$.*

Using duality theorem (2.5), theorem 1.2 determines table 1 completely.

For arbitrary g^r_d on a general curve X, even the simplest case to determine $K_{1,1}(X, L)$ or $K_{0,2}(X, L)$ is open. This is

Conjecture 1.3. *(Maximal rank conjecture for quadrics) For fixed g, r, d, let X be a general curve of genus g and $|L|$ be a general g^r_d on X, then the multiplication map*

$$S^2 H^0(X, L) \xrightarrow{\mu} H^0(X, L^2) \tag{1.1}$$

is of maximal rank i.e. either injective or surjective.

From the definition of Koszul cohomology,

$$K_{1,1}(X, L) = \mathrm{Ker}(\mu) = \{ \text{ Quadrics in } \mathbb{P}^r \text{ containing } X \ \},$$

and

$$K_{0,2}(X, L) = \mathrm{Coker}(\mu),$$

thus the maximal rank conjecture is just the statement that $K_{1,1}(X, L)$ and $K_{0,2}(X, L)$ can not be both nonzero.

Our main results in this paper are theorems 1.4, 1.6 and 1.7.

Theorem 1.4. *Let (X, L) be a general pair in $\mathcal{G}^r_{g,d}$ with $h^1(L) \leq 1$. Suppose*

$$d > \frac{5}{4}g + \frac{9}{4}, \quad \textit{if } h^0(L) = 0, \ \textit{or}$$

$$d > \frac{5}{4}g + \frac{3}{4}, \quad \textit{if } h^0(L) = 1,$$

then (X, L) is projectively normal.

It is a very well known result of Green-Lazarsfeld [17] that any very ample line bundle L on X with

$$deg(L) \geq 2g_X + 1 - 2h^1(L) - Cliff(X) \tag{1.2}$$

is projectively normal and the bound is sharp. Notice that (1.2) implies that $h^1(L) \leq 1$.

If X is general,

$$Cliff(X) = \lfloor \frac{g_X - 1}{2} \rfloor,$$

thus Green-Lazarsfeld theorem predicts projective normality for general curves if d is bigger than roughly $\frac{3}{2}g$. Theorem 1.4 thus says that if L is also general, we could improve the lower bound of d to roughly $\frac{5}{4}g$.

We use an inductive approach to prove theorem 1.4. First notice that to prove projective normality for general (X, L), it suffices to show (1.1) is surjective (c.f corollary 2.2). Secondly we see that conjecture 1.3 (denoted by (MRC)) depends on three discrete parameters g, r and h^1 (and therefore $d = g + r - h^1$). For each fixed pair of nonnegative integers r and h^1, we do induction on g. We start with the base cases $g = (r+1)h^1$ (i.e $\rho = 0$), each step both g and d increase by 1. The key step in the inductive argument is

Theorem 1.5. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a general curve embedded by a general g^r_d $|L|$, and suppose one of the following two conditions holds*

(a) *μ in (1.1) is injective, or*
(b) *μ is surjective and there exists a quadric $Q \in \mathrm{Ker}(\mu)$ containing X but not containing the tangential variety $TX := \cup_{u \in X} T_u X$,*

then $(MRC)^r_{g+1,d+1}$ holds as well.

Theorem 1.4 then follows from theorem 1.5 and the base cases $g = (r+1)h^1$ provided that we can verify the hypothesis about TX in theorem 1.5 (b). The base cases for $h^1 = 0, 1$ correspond to the projective normality of rational normal curves ($h^1 = 0$) and general canonical curves ($h^1 = 1$). We point out that the base case for $h^1 = 2$ was proved in [22] also by infinitesimal methods but via a different degeneration.

We could also fix a small r and let h^1 to be arbitrarily large. This is

Theorem 1.6. *The maximal rank conjecture (for quadrics) holds if $r \leq 4$.*

The reason we can get rid of the restriction on degree of the line bundle for small r is because we can always verify the hypothesis on TX in theorem 1.5 (b) if $r \leq 4$. Thus $(MRC)^r_{g,d}$ always imply $(MRC)^r_{g+1,d+1}$.

For higher syzygies, unlike conjecture 1.3, we do not expect analogously $\min\{k_{p,1}, k_{p-1,2}\} = 0$ for $p \geq 2$. We refer the audience to section 2 for a counterexample. Nevertheless, we do wish to use the inductive approach as above to obtain certain vanishing results or effective upper bounds on $k_{p,q}$.

The difficulty to generalize the inductive argument to higher syzygies is two-fold. Firstly, there are too few known cases to start the induction with. Besides some low genus examples, Voisin's solution to the generic Green conjecture is essentially the only known case. This restrict us only to consider $h^1 = 1$ case. Secondly, for higher syzygies, we do not have an analog of theorem 1.5.

We summarize our results on higher syzygies as below

Theorem 1.7. *Let X be a general curves of genus g, L be a general g^r_d on X. Then*

(a) *If $g \geq r+1$, $K_{p,1}(X, L) = 0$ for $p \geq \lfloor \frac{r+1}{2} \rfloor$.*

(b) *If $h^1(L) = 1$ (which implies that $g \geq r+1$),*

$$K_{p-1,2}(X, L) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq p \leq r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor, \text{ and}$$

$$k_{p-1,2}(X, L) \leq (g - 2r + 2p - 1)\binom{r-1}{p-1} \text{ for } p > r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor.$$

Combining theorem 1.4 and 1.7 (a), we can determine table 1 for general g^r_d with $r \leq 4$:

Corollary 1.8. *For general pair (X, L) in $\mathcal{G}^r_{g,d}$ with $r \leq 4$, $g \geq r+1$,*

$$\min\{k_{p,1}(X, L), k_{p-1,2}(X, L)\} = 0.$$

Unlike the classical degeneration methods, we use an infinitesimal argument to study theorems 1.4 to 1.7, which we describe below.

For a general g^r_d L' on a general curve C of genus g, suppose we have either $K_{p,1}(C, L') = 0$ or $K_{p-1,2}(C, L') = 0$. We construct a reducible nodal curve X_0 of genus $g+1$ by attaching on C an elliptic tail E and construct L_0 on X_0 of degree $d+1$ in a suitable manner such that $H^0(C, L') \cong H^0(X_0, L_0)$. There are two cases we need to take care of in the inductive argument. The easy case is when $K_{p,1}(C, L') = 0$, then $K_{p,1}(X_0, L_0) = 0$ by construction and then one could do induction on g by attaching elliptic tails one at a time. The more difficult case is that when $K_{p-1,2}(C, L')^\vee = K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_C) = 0$. In this case we do not have vanishing of $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ but we can describe the generators of it explicitly and compute the obstructions for these classes to deform to nearby fibers (X_t, L_t). This is explained in sections 3 and 4. The upshot is that (X_0, L_0) are chosen carefully so that $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ is generated by pure tensors in $\wedge^{r-p} H^0(L_0) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_0})$ and therefore it is possible to control the obstructions. It turns out that the obstruction classes lies in $K_{r-p-1,1}(C, L'; K_C) = K_{p,1}(C, L')^\vee$, and they are explicitly written down in theorem 4.1.

When $p = 1$, under the assumption of theorem 1.5, we could fully control these obstructions and show that the extra syzygies in $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ does not deform to nearby fiber and therefore $K_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t}) = 0$. This means that $(MRC)^r_{g,d}$ implies $(MRC)^r_{g+1,d+1}$ and therefore theorem 1.5 holds. This is done in section 5. In this section, we also apply theorem 1.5 to prove theorems 1.4 and 1.6.

Finally in section 6, we consider higher syzygies for line bundles with $h^1 = 1$. It is not clear that all the extra syzygies in $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ are obstructed in general (we do not expect them to be all obstructed anyway). Nevertheless, in some special range of p, we are able to prove some vanishing results as in theorem 1.7.

Acknowledgements. This work is a continuation of my thesis project. I would like to thank my former advisor Herb Clemens for suggesting the problem and method and his constant support on this work. I would also like to thank Aaron Bertram, Gavril Farkas and Joe Harris for generously sharing their ideas on this problem.

2. Preliminaries on Koszul Cohomology

In this section, we recall some basic facts about Koszul cohomology. We will work over the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. Let X be a projective variety and L be a globally generated line bundle with $r+1$ sections on X. The information of the geometry of the map $\phi_{|L|} : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^r$ is encoded in the section ring

$$R = R(X, L) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H^0(X, L^k).$$

Let $V = H^0(X, L)$ and form the symmetric algebra $S = \bigoplus_{k\geq 0} S^k H^0(X, L) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} S^k V$. R is a graded module over S and admits a minimal free resolution of graded S-modules

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \textstyle\bigoplus_q M_{p,q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} S(-q) \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \textstyle\bigoplus_q M_{0,q} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} S(-q) \longrightarrow R \longrightarrow 0.$$

It is well known that the syzygies $M_{p,q}$ can be computed via the Koszul cohomology groups

$$K_{p,q}(X, L) \cong M_{p,p+q} \ .$$

where $K_{p,q}(X, L)$ is defined as in the introduction.

Notice that there is also a twisted version of this theory for any coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on X and any subspace $W \subset V$. We just take

$$R = \bigoplus_{k\geq 0} H^0(X, L^k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{F}).$$

and

$$S = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} S^k W.$$

We denote the Koszul cohomology by

$$K_{p,q}(X,L;\mathcal{F},W).$$

The Koszul cohomology groups gives information about the extrinsic geometry of the variety. For instance,

$$K_{0,q}=0 \text{ for } q\geq 2 \iff M_{0,q}=0 \text{ for } q\geq 2 \iff L \text{ is normally generated.} \tag{2.1}$$

If (2.1) is satisfied,

$$K_{1,q}=0 \text{ for } q\geq 2 \iff M_{1,1+q}=0 \text{ for } q\geq 2 \iff I_X \text{ is generated by quadrics,} \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$I_X=\operatorname{Ker}(S\longrightarrow R)$$

is the homogeneous ideal of X in $\mathbb{P}^r$. This leads to the following definition:

Definition 2.1. *An ample line bundle L on a projective variety X is said to satisfy property (N_p) if $K_{i,q}(X,L)=0$ for and $i\leq p$ and $q\geq 2$.*

Now suppose X is a general curve, and L is a (complete) g^r_d on X. What can we say about the Betti diagram of the section ring of L?

First we have that the multiplication map

$$H^0(X,L)\otimes H^0(X,K_X\otimes L^{-1})\longrightarrow H^0(X,K_X) \tag{2.3}$$

is injective, and if $r\geq 1$, which we shall assume throughout this paper, we have

$$H^0(X,K_X\otimes L^{-2})=0 \tag{2.4}$$

Here (2.3) being injective is the well-known Gieseker-Petri theorem and (2.4) is a direct consequence of it (c.f. [1]). Green pointed out that it follows from (2.4) and the duality theorem of Koszul cohomology

$$K_{p,q}(X,L)=K_{r-1-p,2-q}(X,L;K_X)^\vee \tag{2.5}$$

that

$$K_{p,q}(X,L)=0 \text{ for } q\geq 4.$$

Also from (2.3), we have

$$K_{p,3}(X,L)^\vee=K_{r-1-p,-1}(X,L;K_X)=0 \text{ for } p\leq r-2,$$

since the Koszul differential $d_{r-1-p,-1}$ factors as

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bigwedge^{r-1-p}H^0(L)\otimes H^0(K_X\otimes L^{-1}) \arrow[r, "d_{r-1-p,-1}"] \arrow[d, "\lrcorner\otimes Id"] & \bigwedge^{r-2-p}H^0(L)\otimes H^0(K_X) \\
\bigwedge^{r-2-p}H^0(L)\otimes H^0(L)\otimes H^0(K_X\otimes L^{-1}) \arrow[ur, "Id\otimes\mu"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

and both $\lrcorner\otimes Id$ and $Id\otimes\mu$ are injective.

Combining (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5), we have the following picture of $k_{p,q} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} K_{p,q}(X, L)$:

Table 2.

0	$h^1(L)$	0	...	...	...	0	0	0
0	ρ	$k_{r-2,2}$	...	...	...	$k_{2,2}$	$k_{1,2}$	$k_{0,2}$
0	$k_{r-1,1}$	$k_{r-2,1}$	...	...	...	$k_{2,1}$	$k_{1,1}$	0
0	0	0	...	...	...	0	0	1

As a consequence, we have

Corollary 2.2. *Let X be a general curve, L be a globally generated g^r_d with $r \geq 1$.*

(a) *L is normally generated if and only if the multiplication map*

$$\mu : S^2 H^0(X, L) \longrightarrow H^0(X, L^2)$$

is surjective.

(b) *If L is normally generated, the homogeneous ideal I_X is generated by quadrics and cubics.*

Proof. The only possible nonzero $K_{0,q}$ for $q \geq 2$ is $K_{0,2}(X, L) = \mathrm{Coker}(\mu)$. If $K_{0,2}(X, L) = 0$, L is normally generated by (2.1). $k_{1,q}$ is the number of minimal generators of I_X of degree $q + 1$, so (b) follows. □

Moreover, since taking cohomology does not change the Euler characteristic of the complex, we have for any $1 \leq p \leq r - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} k_{p,1}(X, L) - k_{p-1,2}(X, L) &= \sum_{i+j=p+1} (-1)^{j+1} \dim_{\mathbb{C}}((\bigwedge^i V) \otimes H^0(X, L^j)) \\ &= \binom{r+1}{p}(g - d + r) - \binom{r+1}{p+1} g + \binom{r-1}{p} d + \binom{r}{p+1}(g - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Denote this number $b_p(X, L)$, which only depends on g, r, d, p. Therefore, to determine the Koszul cohomology of (X, L), it suffices to determine either row $q = 1$ or $q = 2$.

Based on the maximal rank conjecture, one might expect that analogously

$$\min\{k_{p,1}(X, L), k_{p-1,2}(X, L)\} = 0 \tag{2.6}$$

for general (X, L). But this is not the case. In fact, F. Schreyer (c.f. [15] (4.a.2)) proved that any curve X of genus g, there exists a number d_0 such that if $\deg(L) = d \geq d_0$, then

$$K_{p,2}(X, L) \neq 0 \text{ if } r - 1 \geq p \geq r - g.$$

On the other hand, it follows from a theorem of Green and Lazarsfeld (c.f [16] or [4] Corollary 3.39) that for d large,

$$K_{p,1}(X, L) \neq 0 \text{ if } 1 \leq p \leq r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor - 2.$$

Thus for $r - g + 1 \leq p \leq r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor - 2$, we do not have (2.6).

3. Koszul cohomology of the central fiber

Let L' be a g^r_d on a smooth curve C of genus g and $X_0 = C \cup E$ be the reducible nodal curve consisting of C and an elliptic curve E meeting at a general point u. Let L_0 be the line bundle on X_0 such that

$$L_0|_C = L',$$

and

$$L_0|_E = \mathcal{O}_E(v)$$

where $v \neq u$. We would like to study the relations between $K_{p,q}(C, L')$ and $K_{p,q}(X_0, L_0)$ in this section.

First observe that by construction, any (global) section of L' on C extends uniquely to a section of L_0 on X_0, thus we have a natural isomorphism $\phi : H^0(C, L') \cong H^0(X_0, L_0)$. Moreover, by Riemann-Roch, $h^1(C, L') = h^1(X_0, L_0)$, and there is a natural identification

$$H^0(C, K_C \otimes L'^{-1}) \cong H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0} \otimes L_0^{-1}).$$

A first consequence is

Proposition 3.1. *If $K_{p,1}(C, L') = 0$, then $K_{p,1}(X_0, L_0) = 0$.*

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bigwedge^{p+1} H^0(L_0) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \bigwedge^{p} H^0(L_0) \otimes H^0(L_0) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \bigwedge^{p-1} H^0(L_0) \otimes H^0(L_0^2) \arrow[d] \\
\bigwedge^{p+1} H^0(L') \arrow[r] & \bigwedge^{p} H^0(L') \otimes H^0(L') \arrow[r] & \bigwedge^{p-1} H^0(L') \otimes H^0(L'^2)
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the vertical arrows are restriction maps to C. The hypothesis says that the lower row is exact in the middle, a simple diagram chasing gives the conclusion. ☐

The argument in proposition 3.1 does not generalize to the case $q = 2$ because $H^0(C, L'^2)$ is not isomorphic to $H^0(X_0, L_0^2)$. Instead, we dualize using (2.5)

$$K_{p-1,2}(C, L')^\vee \cong K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_{X_0})$$

and compare $K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_C)$ with $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$.

Here ω_{X_0} is the dualizing sheaf of X_0 and we will think of sections of the dualizing sheaf as rational forms on each component of X_0 with poles of order at most 1 and with cancellation of residues along the node. In our case, no rational form can have a pole and we have a natural identification

$$\psi : H^0(C, K_C) \oplus H^0(E, K_E) \cong H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0}).$$

Now suppose $K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_C) = 0$, we would like to show that $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ can be generated by pure tensors in

$$\wedge^{r-p} H^0(X_0, L_0) \otimes H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0}).$$

To this end, consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\wedge^{r-p+1}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L'^{-1}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \wedge^{r-p}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\phi\otimes\psi"] & \wedge^{r-p-1}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L') \arrow[d] \\
\wedge^{r-p+1}H^0(L_0) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_0} \otimes L_0^{-1}) \arrow[r, "\delta_{-1}"] & \wedge^{r-p}H^0(L_0) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_0}) \arrow[r, "\delta_0"] & \wedge^{r-p-1}H^0(L_0) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_0} \otimes L_0)
\end{tikzcd}$$

the left vertical arrow is an isomorphism because any section in $H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0} \otimes L_0^{-1})$ restricts to zero on the E component.

Now let $\{\sigma_0, ..., \sigma_r\}$ be a basis of $H^0(C, L')$. Extend σ_k uniquely to X_0 to form a basis of $H^0(X_0, L_0)$, still denoting them by σ_k. Also choose $\{\omega_0, ..., \omega_g\}$ a basis of

$$H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0}) \cong H^0(C, K_C) \oplus H^0(E, K_E)$$

such that under the above identification, $\{\omega_0, ..., \omega_{g-1}\}$ spans $H^0(C, K_C)$ and $\{\omega_g\}$ spans $H^0(E, K_E)$. Observe that $\omega_i|_E = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq g-1$ and $\omega_g|_C = 0$.

We can write any element in $\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_0)$ as

$$\sum_{k_1,...,k_{r-p},j\leq g-1} \alpha_{k_1,...,k_{r-p},j}\ \sigma_{k_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{k_{r-p}} \otimes \omega_j + \sum_{k_1,...,k_{r-p}} \beta_{k_1,...,k_{r-p}}\ \sigma_{k_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{k_{r-p}} \otimes \omega_g$$

Since the image under δ_0 of the second term β restrict to 0 on C (since ω_g does), so does the image of the first term α. By our assumption, the top row of the above diagram is exact in the middle and therefore $\alpha \in \mathrm{Im}(\delta_{-1})$.

We conclude that,

$$\sum_{k_1,...,k_{r-p}} \beta_{k_1,...,k_{r-p}} \sigma_{k_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{k_{r-p}} \otimes \omega_g \in \mathrm{Ker}(\delta_0)$$

and this can happen only if

$$\sum_{k_1,...,k_{r-p}} \beta_{k_1,...,k_{r-p}} \sigma_{k_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{k_{r-p}} \in \bigwedge^{r-p} V,$$

where $V \subset H^0(X_0, L_0)$ is the codimension one subspace consisting of sections which restrict to zero on E. Also it is easy to see that a basis of

$$\bigwedge^{r-p} V \otimes H^0(E, K_E)$$

are linearly in dependent even modulo $\mathrm{Im}(\delta_{-1})$.

We have proven

Lemma 3.2. *Notation as above, if* $K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_C) = 0$, *we have an isomorphism*

$$K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \textstyle\bigwedge^{r-p} V \otimes H^0(E, K_E).$$

4. Infinitesimal calculations

In this section, we carry out the computation of first order obstructions described in the introduction. We will use the deformation theory of complexes which was developed in [18]. The general set up is as below.

Let S be a smooth variety, and $F^\bullet$ be a bounded complex of locally free sheaves on S:

$$\cdots \longrightarrow F^{p-1} \xrightarrow{d_{p-1}} F^p \xrightarrow{d_p} F^{p+1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Given a point $t \in S$, denote $F^\bullet(t)$ the complex of vector spaces at t determined by the fibers of $F^\bullet$, i.e.

$$F^\bullet(t) = F^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}(t),$$

where $\mathbb{C}(t)$ is the residue field of S at t.

The deformation theory of $H^i(F^\bullet(t))$ as t moves near $0 \in S$ is controlled by the derivative complex, which associates a tangent vector $v \in T_0 S$ a complex:

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^{p-1}(F^\bullet(0)) \xrightarrow{D_v(d_{p-1})} H^p(F^\bullet(0)) \xrightarrow{D_v(d_p)} H^{p+1}(F^\bullet(0)) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

A cohomology class $[c] \in H^p(F^\bullet(0))$ deforms to first order along v if and only if $D_v(d_p)([c]) = 0 \in H^{p+1}(F^\bullet(0))$.

To describe the $D_v(d_p)$, recall that a tangent vector $v \in T_0 S$ corresponds to an embedding of the dual numbers D into S. So one gets a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}(0) \longrightarrow D \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}(0) \longrightarrow 0 .$$

Tensoring the sequence with $F^\bullet$ yields a short exact sequence of complexes, which in turn gives rise to connecting homomorphisms

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^p(F^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}(0)) \arrow[r, "D_v(d_p)"] \arrow[d, equal] & H^{p+1}(F^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}(0)) \arrow[d, equal] \\
H^p(F^\bullet(0)) & H^{p+1}(F^\bullet(0))
\end{tikzcd}$$

One checks that $D_v(d_p) \circ D_v(d_{p-1}) = 0$.

Now Let (X_0, L_0) be the pair constructed in the previous section. We will further assume that both (C, L') and the crossing point u are general. (X_0, L_0) determines a limit linear series in the sense of Eisenbud and Harris [10]. By counting Brill-Noether numbers, it is easy to see this limit linear series is deformable to general pairs (X_t, L_t). So let $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{X} \to \Delta$ be the total space of an one parameter family of general pairs $(X_t, L_t) \in \mathcal{G}^r_{g+1,d+1}$ degenerating to (X_0, L_0). We will apply the deformation theory described above to the Koszul complex computing $K_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t})$:

$$\wedge^{r-p+1} H^0(L_t) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_t} \otimes L_t^{-1}) \hookrightarrow \wedge^{r-p} H^0(L_t) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_t}) \xrightarrow{\delta_t} \wedge^{r-p-1} H^0(L_t) \otimes H^0(\omega_{X_t} \otimes L_t).$$

By Gieseker-Petri theorem, the left arrow is injective for all t (even at time zero), so $k_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t})$ can only go up at $t = 0$ if $\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_t)$ does. We would like to compute the derivative of δ_t at $t = 0$:

$$K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0}) \xrightarrow{D_t(\delta_t)} K_{r-p-1,1}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0}). \tag{4.1}$$

By Lemma 3.2 (we are still assuming $K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_C) = 0$),

$$K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0}) \xrightarrow{\cong} (\textstyle\bigwedge^{r-p} V \otimes H^0(E, K_E)).$$

Let

$$\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega \in \bigwedge^{r-p} V \otimes H^0(E, K_E),$$

we will compute its image under $D_t(\delta_t)$. To this end, write

$$M = \mathcal{L}(-E)|_{X_0} = \mathcal{L}(C)|_{X_0}, \ \ N = \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\Delta}(-C)|_{X_0} = \omega_{\mathcal{X}/\Delta}(E)|_{X_0}$$

and let $\tilde{\sigma}_{i_k}$, $\tilde{\omega}$ be sections of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/\Delta}$ extending σ_{i_k} and ω respectively. We can write

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{i_k} = \tilde{\sigma}'_{i_k} s_E \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}' s_C, \tag{4.3}$$

where s_E (resp. s_C) is the section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(E)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(C)$) vanishing precisely on E (resp. C).

By construction of the derivative complex,

$$\begin{aligned} D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega) &= \frac{\delta(\tilde{\sigma}_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \tilde{\sigma}_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \tilde{\omega})}{t}|_{X_0} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{r-p} (-1)^k \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \widehat{\tilde{\sigma}}_{i_k} \wedge ... \wedge \tilde{\sigma}_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}'_{i_k} s_E \tilde{\omega}' s_C}{t}|_{X_0} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{r-p} (-1)^k \sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \widehat{\sigma}_{i_k} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes (\tilde{\sigma}'_{i_k} \tilde{\omega}')|_{X_0} \mod \ \mathrm{Im}\, \delta_0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Since $\tilde{\sigma}'_{i_k}|_{X_0} \in H^0(X_0, M)$ and $\tilde{\omega}'|_{X_0} \in H^0(X_0, N)$, $(\tilde{\sigma}'_{i_k} \tilde{\omega}')|_{X_0}$ may not lie in the image of

$$H^0(X_0, L_0) \otimes H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0}) \xrightarrow{\mu} H^0(X_0, \omega_{X_0} \otimes L_0)$$

and in particular $D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega)$ will contribute to a non-trivial class in $K_{r-p-1,1}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$.

To make this idea more precise, choose a basis $\{\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_r\}$ of V adapted to u i.e. $\sigma_k \in V \subset H^0(X_0, L_0) \cong H^0(C, L')$ vanishes to order exactly k along u and use the same notations as (4.2) and (4.3). We have

$$(\tilde{\sigma}_1' \tilde{\omega}')|_{X_0}$$

is not in the image of μ because its restriction to E is not. Howerever for $k \geq 2$, we could choose suitable extension $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ such that

$$(\tilde{\sigma}_k' \tilde{\omega}')|_E = 0.$$

Thus for any $1 = i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < ... < i_{r-p} \leq r$,

$$D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_1 \wedge \sigma_{i_2} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega) = -\sigma_{i_2} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes (\tilde{\sigma}_1' \tilde{\omega}')|_{X_0} + \sum_{k=2}^{r-p} (-1)^k \sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \widehat{\sigma}_{i_k} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes (\tilde{\sigma}_{i_k}' \tilde{\omega}')|_{X_0},$$

by looking at its restriction to E, we see immediately that

$$\{D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_1 \wedge \sigma_{i_2} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega) |\ 2 \leq i_2 < i_3 < ... < i_{r-p} \leq r\}$$

are linearly independent in $K_{r-p-1,1}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$.

Thus at this point the rank of $D_t(\delta_t)$ is at least

$$\binom{r-1}{p},$$

and therefore

$$k_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t}) \leq \binom{r}{p} - \binom{r-1}{p} = \binom{r-1}{p-1} \tag{4.5}$$

for $t \neq 0$.

On the other hand, for $2 \leq i_1 < ... < i_{r-p} \leq r$, restricting to E does not give any information to $D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega)$ since they all restrict to zero on E (modulo $\mathrm{Im}(\delta_0)$). We will have to study the restriction of $D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega)$ to C.

Since $\tilde{\omega}'|_C \in H^0(C, K_C(2u)) \smallsetminus H^0(C, K_C)$, we will view it as a rational 1-form on C with a pole of order exactly 2 along u and holomorphic everywhere else and denote it by ω'. With the above notation, (4.4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega)|_C &= \sum_{k=1}^{r-p} (-1)^k \sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \widehat{\sigma}_{i_k} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \sigma_{i_k} \omega' \\ &= \delta_0(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega') \bmod \mathrm{Im}\, \delta_0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Remark. Here we are still using δ_0 to denote the restriction to C of the original Koszul differential δ_0 on X_0. Equality (4.6) does not mean $D_t(\delta_t)(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega)|_C \in \mathrm{Im}(\delta_0)$, since ω' has a pole along u.

□

Thus we have reduced the computation of the rank of $D_t(\delta_t)$ to a problem only depends on (C, L').

Theorem 4.1. *Let C be a general curve of genus g, L' be a g^r_d on C such that $K_{r-p,0}(C, L'; K_C) = 0$ and $\{\sigma_0, ..., \sigma_r\}$ is a basis of $H^0(C, L')$ adapted to a general point $u \in C$, and $\omega' \in H^0(C, K_C(2u)) \smallsetminus H^0(C, K_C)$. Consider the obstruction classes*

$$\{\delta_0(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega') \ : \ 2 \leq i_1 < ... < i_{r-p} \leq r\} \subset K_{r-p-1,1}(C, L'; K_C).$$

(a) *If these classes are linearly independent in $K_{r-p-1,1}(C, L', K_C)$, then*

$$K_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t}) \cong K_{p-1,2}(X_t, L_t)^\vee = 0.$$

(b) *On the other hand, if these classes span $K_{r-p-1,1}(C, L'; K_C)$, then*

$$k_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t}) \leq \binom{r-1}{p-1} - k_{r-p-1,1}(C, L'; K_C) = -b_{p+1}(X_t, L_t).$$

which implies $K_{p,1}(X_t, L_t) = 0$.

Proof. The hypothesis in case (a) implies that $D_t(\delta_t)$ in (4.1) is either injective , which means no elements in $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ will extend to nearby. In case (b), the rank of $D_t(\delta_t)$ is

$$k_{r-p-1,1}(C, L'; K_C) + \binom{r-1}{p},$$

which implies that

$$k_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t}) \leq \binom{r-1}{p-1} - k_{r-p-1,1}(C, L'; K_C) = -b_{p+1}(X_t, L_t).$$

Therefore only a subspace of $K_{r-p,0}(X_0, L_0; \omega_{X_0})$ of correct dimension will extend to nearby fibers to first order. $\square$

To end this section, we give a sufficient condition for the obstruction classes in theorem 4.1 to be linearly independent. Consider the diagram of complexes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\wedge^{r-p+1}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L'^{-1}) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, equal] & \wedge^{r-p}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C) \arrow[r, "\delta_0"] \arrow[d, hook, "\alpha"] & \wedge^{r-p-1}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L') \arrow[d] \\
\wedge^{r-p+1}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L'^{-1}) \arrow[r, hook] & \wedge^{r-p}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C(2u))) \arrow[r, "\delta"] & \wedge^{r-p-1}H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L'(2u))
\end{tikzcd}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Notation and assumption same as theorem 4.1, if the bottom row is exact in the middle, then the obstruction classes*

$$\{\delta_0(\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega') \ : \ 2 \leq i_1 < ... < i_{r-p} \leq r\}$$

are linearly independent modulo $\mathrm{Im}(\delta_0)$. *As a consequence of theorem 4.1, $K_{r-p,0}(X_t, L_t; \omega_{X_t}) = 0$.*

Proof. It is obvious that

$$\{\sigma_{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge \sigma_{i_{r-p}} \otimes \omega'\}$$

are linearly independent in $\wedge^{r-p}H^0(L')\otimes H^0(K_C(2u))$ modulo image of α. The assumption implies that $\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_0)=\mathrm{Ker}(\delta)\cong\wedge^{r-p+1}H^0(L')\otimes H^0(K_C\otimes L'^{-1})$. Then the statement follows from a simple diagram chasing.

□

5. Applications to the Maximal Rank Conjecture

We prove theorem 1.5 in this section. This sets up an inductive approach to the Maximal Rank Conjecture.

Proof. of **theorem 1.5.)** Let C be a general curve of genus g and L' be a general g^r_d on C satisfying the maximal rank conjecture. Let (X_0,L_0) be as in section 3.

(a) If $K_{1,1}(C,L')=0$, then by proposition 3.1, $K_{1,1}(X_0,L_0)=0$ and $(MRC)^r_{g+1,d+1}$ follows from upper-semicontinuity of Koszul cohomology.

(b) Now suppose the other case that $k_{0,2}(C,L')=k_{r-1,0}(C,L';K_C)=0$. We need to show that, under the assumption (b) of theorem 1.5, $K_{r-1,0}(X_t,L_t;K_{X_t})=0$.

By theorem 4.1 and lemma 4.2, it suffices to show that the sequence

$$\wedge^r H^0(L')\otimes H^0(K_C\otimes L'^{-1})\hookrightarrow\wedge^{r-1}H^0(L')\otimes H^0(K_C(2u)))\xrightarrow{\delta}\wedge^{r-2}H^0(L')\otimes H^0(K_C\otimes L'(2u))$$

is exact or equivalently

$$\mathrm{Ker}(\delta)\cong\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_0),$$

which follows from the next lemma.

□

Let $M_{L'}$ be the kernel bundle defined by the sequence

$$0\longrightarrow M_{L'}\longrightarrow H^0(L')\otimes\mathcal{O}_C\longrightarrow L'\longrightarrow 0\ .$$

Taking $(r-1)$-th wedge, twisting by K_C (resp. $K_C(2u)$) and then taking global sections, we get

$$\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_0)=H^0(C,\wedge^{r-1}M_{L'}\otimes K_C)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Ker}(\delta)=H^0(C,\wedge^{r-1}M_{L'}\otimes K_C(2u))$$

Also notice that

$$\wedge^r M_{L'}\cong L'^{-1}$$

and therefore

$$\wedge^{r-1}M^{\vee}_{L'}\cong M_{L'}\otimes L'.$$

Lemma 5.1. *For a general g^r_d L' on a general curve C of genus g, if there exists a quadric $Q\subset\mathbb{P}^r$ containing $\phi_{|L'|}(C)$ but not containing its tangential surface $TC:=\cup_{u\in C}T_uC\subset\mathbb{P}^r$, then*

$$H^0(C,\wedge^{r-1}M_{L'}\otimes K_C)=H^0(C,\wedge^{r-1}M_{L'}\otimes K_C(2u)).$$

Proof. By Riemann-Roch, it suffices to show that

$$h^0(M_{L'} \otimes L') = h^0(M_{L'} \otimes L'(-2u)) + 2r.$$

We have diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & H^0(M_{L'} \otimes L'(-2u)) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & H^0(L') \otimes H^0(L'(-2u)) \arrow[r, "\mu'"] \arrow[d, hook] & H^0(L'^2(-2u)) \arrow[d, hook] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^0(M_{L'} \otimes L') \arrow[r] & H^0(L') \otimes H^0(L') \arrow[r, "\mu"] & H^0(L'^2) \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let $H_u := H^0(L') \otimes H^0(L'(-2u))$ and $\overline{H}_u$ be its image in

$$\frac{H^0(L') \otimes H^0(L')}{\wedge^2 H^0(L')} \cong S^2 H^0(L')$$

.

By hypothesis, $\overline{\mathrm{Ker}(\mu)} \not\subseteq \overline{H}_u$ for general u (since $Q \notin \overline{H}_u$), then it follows that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathrm{Ker}(\mu')}) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathrm{Ker}(\mu)} \cap \overline{H}_u) < \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathrm{Ker}(\mu)}) =: m$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{Ker}(\mu')) &\leq m - 1 + \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\wedge^2 H^0(L') \cap H_u) \\
&= m - 1 + \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\wedge^2 H^0(L'(-2u))) \\
&= m - 1 + \binom{r-1}{2} = m + \binom{r+1}{2} - 2r \\
&= \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{Ker}(\mu)) - 2r.
\end{aligned}$$

□

To apply theorem 1.5, we need to verify the assumption about the tangential variety in (b). By appendix, if L' is a general non-special g^r_{2r-3} on a general curve C of genus $r-3$, the number of quadrics containing TC is at most

$$\binom{r-4}{2}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ be a general curve of genus g embedded by a general g^r_d L' with $h^1(L') \leq 1$. Suppose*

$$\binom{r+2}{2} - (2d - g + 1) > \binom{r-4}{2},$$

then there exists a quadric Q on $\mathbb{P}^r$ containing C but not containing TC.

Proof. Degenerate (C, L') to (C_0, L'_0) where C_0 is a nodal curve with two smooth components Y and Z meeting at a general point u. According to the value of $h^1(L')$, there are two cases.

(a) $h^1(L') = 0$.

$L' = g^r_{g+r}$ for $g \geq 0$. If $0 \leq g \leq r-3$, take $g_Y = 0$, $g_Z = g$, $L'_0|_Y = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r)$ and $L'_0|_Z = g^0_g$ (One could easily show such (C_0, L'_0) can deform to (C, L')). Since there are only

$$\binom{r-2}{2}$$

quadrics containing the tangential variety of the rational normal curve in $\mathbb{P}^r$ (see appendix) and in this range of g, the number of quadrics containing C is at least

$$\binom{r+2}{2} - (2d-g+1) = \binom{r+2}{2} - (g+2r+1) > \binom{r-2}{2},$$

we conclude that there exists a quadric containing the nearby fiber C but not containing TC.

If $g > r-3$, we take $g_Y = r-3$, $g_Z = g-r+3$, $L'_0|_Y = g^r_{2r-3}$ (a general one) and $L'_0|_Z = g^0_{g-r+3}$. By the numerical hypothesis and proposition 7.1, we get the same conclusion.

(b) $h^1(L') = 1$.

The argument is similar as above except that we need to deal with $L' = g^r_{g+r-1}$ for $g \geq r+1$. Again, if $r+1 \leq g \leq 2r-2$, we take $g_Y = 0$, $Z = C$, $L'_0|_Y = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(r)$ and $L'_0|_Z = L'(-ru) = g^0_{g-1}$.

If $g > 2r-2$, take $g_Y = r-3$, $g_Z = g-r+3$, $L'_0|_Y = g^r_{2r-3}$, $L'_0|_Z = g^0_{g-r+2}$. Here $L'_0|_Z$ comes from a general g^r_{g+2} on Z twisted by $\mathcal{O}_Z(-ru)$. The rest of the argument is exactly the same as case (a).

□

We could use lemma 5.2 and theorem 1.5 to prove theorem 1.4.

Proof. of **theorem 1.4)** First notice that by corollary 2.2, to show projective normality of a general pair, it suffices to show (1.1) is surjective. We will fix h^1 and r and do induction on g.

For $h^1 = 0$ case, we start with the fact that rational normal curve is projectively normal, (i.e. $(MRC)^r_{0,r}$ holds). For $h^1 = 1$ case, we use the fact that general canonical curve is projectively normal (i.e. $(MRC)^r_{r+1,2r}$ holds). Now assuming $(MRC)^r_{g,d}$ holds, by lemma 5.2, as long as

$$\binom{r+2}{2} - (2d-g+1) > \binom{r-4}{2}, \tag{5.1}$$

theorem 1.5 (b) is satisfied, which implies $(MRC)^r_{g+1,d+1}$ (which is equivalent to projective normality). Plug in $d = g+r-h^1$ to (5.1), we immediately get the bound on d as in the statement of the theorem.

□

Proof. of **theorem 1.6)** The case $r = 1, 2$ is trivial. The arguments for $r = 3, 4$ are completely similar, so we will only prove the case $r = 4$. Again we do induction on g. First suppose we have proved (MRC) for the base cases $g = 5h^1$, $L = g^4_{4h^1+4}$. Then notice that for $r = 4$, $\binom{r-4}{2} =$

0 and therefore there is no quadric containing the tangential variety in theorem 1.5 (b). Thus $(MRC)^4_{g,d}$ implies $(MRC)^4_{g+1,d+1}$. It remains to prove (MRC) for the base cases. When $h^1 \leq 1$ $(MRC)^4_{5h^1,4h^1+4}$ is clear. If $h^1 \geq 2$, we need to show μ in (1.1) is injective. For $h^1 = 2$, $(MRC)^4_{10,12}$ is well known and is proved in [12]. If $h^1 \geq 3$, we we could degenerate again to $C_0 = Y \cup Z$ with $g_Y = 10$, $g_X = 5h^1 - 10$, $L_0|_Y = g^4_{12}$, $L_0|_Z = g^0_{4h^1-8} = g^4_{4h^1-4}(-4u)$, again it is easy to check such (C_0, L_0) is smoothable in $\mathcal{G}^4_{5h^1,4h^1+4}$ (c.f [22] corollary 6.1 for details). The injectivity of μ in this case follows from the same argument as in proposition 3.1. ☐

It was also proved in [13] that for any integer $s \geq 1$, $(MRC)^{2s}_{s(2s+1),2s(s+1)}$ holds. In this case, $\rho = 0$ and $h^1 = s$. Thus by theorem 1.5 (a), we have

Corollary 5.3. *$(MRC)^{2s}_{s(2s+1)+k,2s(s+1)+k}$ holds for all $s \geq 1$, $k \geq 0$, i.e. (MRC) holds if $r = 2h^1$.*

6. Higher syzygies

As we mentioned in the introduction, the difficulty to generalize the inductive argument to higher syzygies is due to the lack of known cases to start the induction with and no analog of theorem 1.5 for higher syzygies. Nevertheless, we collect some vanishing results we can obtain in this section.

Proposition 6.1. *For a general g^r_d L on a general curve X with $g \geq r+1$, $K_{p,1}(X, L) = 0$ for $p \geq \lfloor \frac{r+1}{2} \rfloor$.*

Proof. Start with the case $g_X = r+1$, $L' = K_X$, thanks to Voisin's solution to the generic Green conjecture, $K_{p,1}(X, K_X) = 0$ for $p \geq \lfloor \frac{r+1}{2} \rfloor$. If $g > r+1$, we degenerate to $X_0 = Y \cup Z$ with $g_Y = r+1$, $g_Z = g - r - 1$, $L_0|_Y = K_Y$, $L_0|_Z = g^0_{d-2r} = g^r_{d-r}(-ru)$. The statement then follows from the same argument as in proposition 3.1.

☐

Remark. Using the same degeneration as in proposition 6.1, we also have

$$k_{p,1}(X, L) \leq k_{p.1}(Y, K_Y) = [\binom{r-1}{p} - \binom{r-1}{p-1}]r + \binom{r+1}{p} - \binom{r+1}{p+1}$$

for $1 \leq p < \lfloor \frac{r+1}{2} \rfloor$. We will improve this bound using an infinitesimal argument.

☐

Even though we do not have an analog of theorem 1.5, when g is not too big, the inductive argument still go through:

Lemma 6.2. *Let C be a general curve of genus g and L' be a g^r_d with $h^1(L') = 1$. If $p \leq r - \lfloor \frac{g+1}{2} \rfloor$, then the sequence*

$$\wedge^{r-p+1} H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L'^{-1}) \hookrightarrow \wedge^{r-p} H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C(2u))) \xrightarrow{\delta} \wedge^{r-p-1} H^0(L') \otimes H^0(K_C \otimes L'(2u))$$

is exact in the middle.

Proof. Let $t \in H^0(K_C \otimes L'^{-1})$ be a generator. Multiplication by t gives an embedding

$$H^0(L') \xrightarrow{\cdot t} H^0(K_C)\ .$$

Denote its image W. Let C' be the image of C under the map given by $|K_C(2u)|$. C' is of arithematic genus $g+1$ and has a cusp. We can identify $H^0(C, K_C(2u))$ with $H^0(C', \omega_{C'})$, where $\omega_{C'}$ is the dualizing sheaf of C'. With the above notation, we can identify the cohomology group in question with $K_{r-p,1}(C', \omega_{C'}; W) \subset K_{r-p,1}(C', \omega_{C'})$. Since curves in $K3$ surfaces satisfies Green conjecture (c.f. [23], [24]), by degenerating C' to a cuspidal curve in $K3$ surface, we have

$$K_{r-p,1}(C', \omega_{C'}) = 0$$

for $r - p \geq \lfloor \frac{g+1}{2} \rfloor$.

□

Again we start our induction with a general curve of genus $r+1$, and $L' = K_C$. For $p < \lfloor \frac{r+1}{2} \rfloor$, we have

$$K_{p-1,2}(C, K_C)^\vee \cong K_{r-p,1}(C, K_C) = 0$$

Now we apply the construction in section 3, by lemma 4.2 and lemma 6.2, we get

Theorem 6.3. *For a general g^r_d L on a general curve X with $h^1(L) = 1$,*

(a) $k_{p-1,2}(X, L) = k_{r-p,0}(X, L; K_X) = 0$ *if* $p \leq r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor$.
(b) $k_{p-1,2}(X, L) \leq (g - 2r + 2p - 1)\binom{r-1}{p-1}$ *if* $p > r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor$.

Proof. Again we start our induction on g with a general curve of genus $r+1$, and $L' = K_C$. We always have

$$K_{p-1,2}(C, K_C)^\vee \cong K_{r-p,1}(C, K_C) = 0.$$

for $r - p \geq \lfloor \frac{r+1}{2} \rfloor$.

Now we apply the construction in section 3. If $\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor \leq r - p$, lemma 4.2 and 6.2 applies and we get (a).

When $\lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor$ get passed $r - p$ (or equivalently $g > 2r - 2p + 1$), we nevertheless have estimate (4.5) for each attached elliptic tail. Thus the bounds in (b) follows.

□

Remark. For line bundles with $h^1 = 1$ the assumption $p \leq r - \lfloor \frac{g}{2} \rfloor$ is equivalent to the condition that $d \geq 2g - 2 + p - \lfloor \frac{g-1}{2} \rfloor$. Thus theorem 6.3 is the generic version of the generalized Green-Lazarsfeld conjecure for special linear series (c.f [17]). However, this generic version is known to follow from the generic Green conjecture (c.f [3] proposition 4.30). It seems to the author that the bound in (b) is new.

□

7. Appendix

In this appendix, we prove the following statement, which is needed in the proof of theorem 1.4.

Proposition 7.1. *For a general curve $C$of genus $r-3$ embedded in $\mathbb{P}^r$ by a general g^r_{2r-3}, the number of quadrics containing TC is at most*

$$\binom{r-4}{2}.$$

Consider the rational normal curve C of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^d$. It is well known that there are

$$\binom{d}{2}$$

independent quadrics containing C. Denote them $\Delta_{a,b}$ for $0 \leq a < b \leq d-1$, where $\Delta_{a,b}$ is the 2×2 minor corresponding to columns a and b of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 & \dots & \dots & x_{d-2} & x_{d-1} \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & \dots & x_{d-1} & x_d \end{pmatrix}$$

with the usual convention that $\Delta_{a,b} = -\Delta_{b,a}$.

It is proved in [7] that there are

$$\binom{d-2}{2}$$

quadrics containing TC. They are

$$\Gamma_{a,b} = \Delta_{a+2,b} - 2\Delta_{a+1,b+1} + \Delta_{a,b+2}$$

for $0 \leq a, b \leq d-3$.

Now consider the projection C' of C to $\mathbb{P}^r$ ($d = 2r-3$, $r \geq 3$) given by:

$$t \longrightarrow [1, t^2, t^4, ..., t^{2r-6}, t^{2r-5}, t^{2r-4}, t^{2r-3}].$$

C' has arithmetic genus $r-3$ and has a unique singular point at $t = 0$ locally isomorphic to $Spec(\mathbb{C}[t^2, t^{2r-5}])$. Since this is a plane curve singularity, C' is smoothable. $\mathcal{O}_{C'}(1)$ is a non-special g^r_{2r-3} on C' thus also smoothable. We could explicitly compute the quadrics containing TC': they are just quadrics in $\mathbb{P}^d$ containing TC with singular locus containing the center of projection $L = span\{P_1, P_3, ..., P_{2r-7}\} \cong \mathbb{P}^{r-4}$ where $P_i = [0, 0, ..., 1^{(ith)}, ..., 0]$.

Now if we think of each quadric $\Gamma_{a,b}$ as a $(2r-2) \times (2r-2)$ symmetric matrix, we are just looking for matrices $Q \in \ S_\Gamma := span\{\Gamma_{a,b} |\ 0 \leq a < b \leq 2r-6\}$ such that $L \subset \operatorname{Ker} Q$.

Notice that each $\Gamma_{a,b}$, as a matrix, only has possibly non-zero entries at (i,j)-spot if

$$i + j = a + b + 3.$$

For each $4 \leq k \leq 4r-10$, there are $(\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1)$ $\Gamma_{a,b}$'s on the line

$$i + j = k, \text{ for } 4 \leq k \leq 2r-3,$$

and $(2r-4-\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor)$ $\Gamma_{a,b}$'s if $2r-3 < k \leq 4r-10$.

Write

$$S_\Gamma = \oplus_{k=4}^{4r-10} S_k$$

where $S_k = span\{\Gamma_{a,b}|\ 0 \leq a < b \leq 2r-6,\ a+b=k-3\}$. It is obvious that if $Q \in S_\Gamma$ vanishes on L, then its S_k component also vanishes on L. Thus it suffices to count how many quadrics in each S_k vanishes on L.

Let's just consider the case $4 \leq k \leq 2r-3$, the other case is similar.

When k is odd, vanishing on L imposes $(\frac{k-1}{2})$ independent conditions on S_k, more than dimension of S_k. Thus no quadrics in S_k vanishes on L.

When k is even, vanishing on L only imposes $\lceil \frac{k}{4} \rceil$ independent conditions. We conclude that for $4 \leq k \leq 2r-3$, there are

$$\sum_{8 \leq k \leq 2r-4,\ k \text{ even}} \left(\frac{k}{2} - 1 - \lceil \frac{k}{4} \rceil\right) = \lfloor \frac{r^2-8r+16}{4} \rfloor$$

quadrics containing TC' (if $r \leq 5$ there are none!).

Similarly, for $2r-3 < k \leq 4r-10$, we count that there are

$$\lfloor \frac{r^2-8r+16}{4} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{r-4}{2} \rfloor$$

quadrics containing TC'.

So we get total of

$$\lfloor \frac{r^2-8r+16}{4} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{r^2-8r+16}{4} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{r-4}{2} \rfloor = \binom{r-4}{2}$$

quadrics containing TC'. By specializing to C', we get a proof of proposition 7.1.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Arbarello and M. Cornalba, Su una congettura di Petri, Comment. Math. Helvetici **56**, 1-38, 1981.

[2] E. Arbarello, M. Cornalba, P. Griffiths and J. Harris, Geometry of Algebraic Curves, Volume I, Springer Grundlehren **267**, 1985.

[3] M. Aprodu, G. Farkas, The Green conjecture for curves on arbitrary $K3$ surface, Compositio Math. **147**, 839-851, 2011.

[4] M. Aprodu, J. Nagel, Koszul Cohomology and Algebraic Geometry, University Lecture Series, Volumn **52**, American Mathematical Society, 2010.

[5] E. Ballico and P. Ellia, The maximal rank conjecture for nonspecial curves in $\mathbb{P}^n$, Math. Z. **196**, 355-367, 1987.

[6] F. Cukierman and D. Ulmer, Curves of genus ten on $K3$ surfaces, Compositio Mathematica **89**, 81-90, 1993.

[7] D. Eisenbud, Green's conjecture: an orientation for algebraists. Free resolutions in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry (Sundance, UT, 1990), 5178, Res. Notes Math., 2, Jones and Bartlett, Boston, MA, 1992.

[8] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, A simpler proof of the Gieseker-Petri theorem on special divisors, Invent. Math. **74**, 269-280, 1983.

[9] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, Divisors on general curves and cuspidal rational curves. Invent. Math. **74**, 371-418, 1983.

[10] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, Limit linear series: Basic theory, Invent. Math. **85**, 337-371, 1986.

[11] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, Irreducibility and monodromy of some families of linear series, Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure, Sér.4, **20**, 65-87, 1987.

[12] G. Farkas and M. Popa, Effective divisors on $\mathcal{M}_g$, curves on K3 surfaces, and the slope conjecture, J. Algebraic Geom. **14(2)**, 241–267, 2005.

[13] G. Farkas, Koszul divisors on moduli space of curves, Amer. J. Math. **131**, 819-867, 2009.

[14] D. Gieseker, Stable curves and special divisors, Invent. Math. **66**, 251-275, 1982.

[15] M. Green, Koszul cohomology and the geometry of projective varieties, J. Differential Geom. **19** 125-171, 1984.

[16] M. Green and R. Lazarsfeld, The nonvanishing of certain Koszul Koszul cohomology groups, J. Diff. Geom. **19**, 168-170, 1984.

[17] M. Green and R. Lazarsfeld, On the projective normality of complete linear series on an algebraic curve, Invent. Math. **83**, 73-90, 1986.

[18] M. Green and R. Lazarsfeld, Deformation theory, generic vanishing theorems, and some conjectures of Enriques, Catanese and Beauville, Invent. Math. **90**, 389-407, 1987.

[19] J. Harris, Curves in projective space, Les Press de l'Universit$\acute{e}$ de Montr$\acute{e}$al, 1982.

[20] J. Harris and I. Morrison, Moduli of Curves, Graduate Text in Mathematics **187**, Springer-Verlag New York, 1998.

[21] J. Wang, Deformations of pairs (X, L) when X is singular, http://arxiv.org/abs/1003.6073

[22] J. Wang, On the maximal rank conjecture for line bundles of extremal degree, http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.1163

[23] C. Voisin, Green's generic syzygy conjecture for curves of even genus lying on a $K3$ surface. J. Eur. Math.Soc., **4**, 363-404, 2002.

[24] C. Voisin, Green's canonical syzygy conjecture for generic curves of odd genus. Compositio Math., **141** (5), 1163-1190, 2005.

Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, 231 W. 18th Ave., Columbus, OH 43210

E-mail address: `jwang@math.ohio-state.edu`

E-mail address: `(current) wangjie@math.utah.edu`